arXiv:gr-qc/0501094v5 25 Jan 2007

On the Maximal Universal Acceleration in Deterministic Finslerian Models

February 7, 2008

Ricardo Gallego Torrome
Ravensburger Strasse, 20
88267, Vogt
Germany

Abstract

The existence of a maximal acceleration for deterministic finslerian models at the Planck scale is argued. Possible phenomenological relativity groups $O(1,6), O(1,7)$ and $O(2,6)$ are introduced from the perspective of finslerian deterministic models. The effect of maximal acceleration delaying the speed of light is studied. Finally, a mechanism generating maximal acceleration in connection with bosonic string theory is discussed.

1 Introduction

Maximal acceleration in string theory appeared first in [1]. If the Hagedorn temperature ([2]) is of order of the Planck temperature T_p, this acceleration only depends on universal constants, being of order $10^{52}\, m/s^2$. The mechanism producing the maximal acceleration seems to be related with the divergence of the string partition function. This divergence is associated with the existence of a minimal length for the strings([1]).

Another argument in favor of the universal maximal acceleration is based on the Unruh effect ([3]). In this contest, at the maximal temperature, an equivalent maximal acceleration accessible for a local coordinate system respect an inertial frame is obtained. If the maximal temperature is the Planck temperature T_p, this acceleration is of order $10^{52}\, m/s^2$.

Finslerian space-time models also contain an universal maximal acceleration ([4]). Again, the definition of a characteristic length is present in these models. If this length is the Planck length, we obtain again a maximal acceleration of the same order $10^{52}\, m/s^2$.

Other approaches like the original Caianiello's approach ([5]) and Castro's extended relativity ([6]) contain also a maximal acceleration.

In all these examples the maximal accelerations have the same formal expression,

$$a_m = c^2/L_m, \tag{1.1}$$

L_m is some characteristic minimal length of each particular theory. For $L_m \sim L_p$ we obtain $a_m \sim 10^{52}\, m/s^2$.

What is the origin of the maximal acceleration for such different frameworks? In this paper we give some insights on this question in the contest of deterministic finslerian models ([7]). We argue that maximal acceleration is a consequence of the existence of a maximal velocity and minimal scale. Using basic arguments, we obtain that for the dynamics of a gas of particles under these constrains, implies the expression (1.1) for the maximal acceleration. These constrains are equivalent to have causal and strongly local interactions, defining the "action" on the elementary system by the "smallest surrounding neighborhood".

The structure of this note is the following: in Section 2 we recall some facts about deterministic finslerian models and we present a derivation of the maximal acceleration in this context. In Section 3, new possible relativity groups are discussed. We introduce these groups from the perspective of deterministic finslerian models, as possible descriptions of the space-time that the deterministic fisnlerian models could admit. We consider $O(1,6)$ as the simples group where a maximal speed and acceleration in a three dimensional configuration space hold. The delay of the maximal speed due to the maximal acceleraion, is also discussed. We speculate in Section 4 on the mechanism producing the maximal universal acceleration and we find in this context that bosonic strings are phenomenological description of deterministic systems. Conclusions are obtained in Section 5.

2 Maximal Acceleration in Finslerian Deterministic Models at the Planck Scale

The relation between Finsler Geometry and deterministic models at the Plank scale has been discussed recently in [7].

Let us recall the basics facts and notation. By **M** we denote the configuration manifold of all the degrees of freedom at the Planck scale. The tangent bundle **TM** (not directly **M**) is equipped with a dual Randers metric F^*,

$$\mathbf{T}^*\mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$$

$$(x,p) \longrightarrow F^*(x,p) = \alpha(x,p) + \beta(x,p),$$

where $x \in \mathbf{TM}$ and $p \in \mathbf{T}^*{}_x\mathbf{TM}$. $\alpha(x,p) = \sqrt{a_{ij}(x)p^i p^j}$ is a Riemannian metric defined on $\mathbf{TM} \setminus \{0\}$. For a fixed x, $\beta(x,p) = \beta^i(x)p_i$ is a linear form in p (see reference [8] for an introduction to the basic notions of Finsler Geometry and [9] for our average construction). The fundamental tensor g is given basically by the hessian of $(F^*)^2$ in natural coordinates. This fundamental tensor should be positive definite. For Randers structures, it is equivalent to say that the 1-form β is bounded by the metric α, $\|\beta\| < 1$.

A Randers metric is non-reversible because $F^*(x,p) \neq F^*(x,-p)$. Using this property, the classical Hamiltonian function is defined by

$$\mathbf{H} := F^*(x,p) - F^*(T_t(x), T_t(p)) = 2\beta^i(x)p_i, \quad i = 1, ..., 6N. \tag{2.1}$$

T_t is the time inversion operation. The expression (2.1) is the Hamiltonian function of a deterministic classical system ([12]). Although apparent arbitrary, this definition of the fundamental hamiltonian can be argued by,

1. In the contest of $E \to -E$, our formulation is similar to a Hamiltonian version of the symmetry proposed in ([17]), but in a non-symmetric geometry contest.
2. This choice of the Hamiltonian implies an invariant evolution operator under time inversion. It is our approach to the postulate of a fundamental irreversible mechanics.
3. If the average procedure defined below is interpreted as an evolution towards a Poincare limit, the final total Hamiltonian is zero. This corresponds to the normal situation if time is a gauge parameter.

The typical form of this Hamiltonian could invite to think that the metric α plays any role. However, that is not true, because the Hamiltonian (2.1) can be writing

$$\mathbf{H} := F^*(x,p) - F^*(T_t(x), T_t(p)) = 2\beta^i(x)p_i = 2\beta^i p^j \alpha_{ij}.$$

In this form, the canonical conditions are given by $[x^i, p^j] = \alpha^{ij}$.

Other basic ingredient is the U_t-evolution. Given the Finsler structure $(\mathbf{TM}, F^*)$, it is possible to define an average Riemannian structure h ([9]), obtained by averaging the fundamental tensor g in each co-tangent space $\mathbf{T^*}_x\mathbf{TM}$. Assuming ergodic property, this average in the "phase space" is equivalent to an average in internal time t. If this equivalence holds, it defines a dissipative evolution of the geometric structures:

$$U_t : (\mathbf{TM}, F^*) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{TM}, F^*_t), \;\; F^*_t = k(t)h + (1-k(t))g, \;\; \lim_{t\to 1} k(t) = 1. \quad (2.2)$$

A mechanism eliminating the gauge time t as a parameter consist on postulating the condition

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{total}} = 0 \quad (2.3)$$

for the total hamiltonian. However in [7] it was described a mechanism generating (2.3): if the Randers structure $(\mathbf{T^*TM}, F^*)$ evolves to the final Riemannian structure $(\mathbf{T^*TM}, h)$, the final total Hamiltonian function (2.1) is identically zero. Therefore, the constrain (2.3) holds in average.

Let us suppose the existence of a minimal distance L_m, the maximal physical speed is the speed of light in vacuum c and the ontological degrees of freedom of the model consist of "molecules" of a classical gas of mass m. We can write the elementary work that the rest of the universe can make on a defined elementary sub-system. Since this maximal work is equivalent to the energy of the particles involved, we obtain the relation

$$L_m m\, a_m \sim \delta m\, v^2_{max}.$$

Using causality hypothesis for interactions, implies $v_{max} \leq c$. We denote by strong locality the property that only the "smallest" neighborhood of the elementary sub-system considered is involved in the change of speed. If strong locality holds, then $\delta m \sim -m$. Again, in the case where the colliding particles are in the same direction, this relation is the equality $\delta m = -m$.

However, for the case of a relaxed Riemannian structure, the total Hamiltonian operator is zero. This fact implies, for the averaged of the operator Hamilonian,

$$< \hat{\mathbf{H}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{rest} >= 0.$$

$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_1$ is the Hamiltonian associated with the elementary sub-system and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{rest}$ is the Hamiltonian operator of the rest of the universe. Therefore, taking the average value in this relation over an eigenstate of $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ of mass m times an eigenstate of the rest of the universe, one obtains

$$< 1| \otimes < rest|(\hat{\mathbf{H}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{rest})|rest > \otimes |1 >=$$

$$< 1|\hat{\mathbf{H}}_1|1 > + < rest|\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{rest}|rest >= m + \delta m = 0,$$

and as a consequence

$$\delta m = -m, \tag{2.4}$$

proving that the system in average behaves strongly local.

The exact value for the maximal acceleration is $a_m = \frac{c^2}{L_m}$. If $L_p = L_m$, this value is of the same order than the value obtained in string theory. However, it could be also possible other universal values for L_m. In particular m could be associated with mass of the lightest neutrino. In this case, the maximal and universal acceleration seems able to be tested ([14]).

3 The Relativity Groups $O(1,6), O(1,7)$ and $O(2,6)$

If the ontological maximal acceleration is preserved or induces a maximal acceleration at the quantum and macroscopic level, we should introduce a new relativity group capable to capture in a natural way this condition, together with the maximal character of the speed of light. Firstly, let us consider the flat space-time $\mathbf{R}^4$ with the metric

$$d\tau_4^2 := (dx^0)^2 - dx_1^2 - dx_2^2 - dx_3^2 = (dx^0)^2 - (d\vec{x})^2.$$

$O(1,3)$ is the isometry group of this metric and since $x^0 = cs$, it produces a pseudo-rotation of the light-cone and in particular, the invariant maximal physical speed results to be the speed of light in vacuum c. This corresponds geometrically with the invariance of the null interval $d\tau_4^2 = 0$.

Imitating Special Relativity, we try to find the simplest relativity group admitting both, an upper bound for the speed $y^i y_i$, $y^i = \frac{dx^i(s)}{ds}$ and for the acceleration $a^i a_i$, $a^i = \frac{dy^i(s)}{ds}$. The simplest group seems to be $O(1,6)$, which preserves the metric

$$d\tau_7^2 = (dx^0)^2 - dx_1^2 - dx_2^2 - dx_3^2 - dz_1^2 - dz_2^2 - dz_3^2 \tag{3.1}$$

defined in $\mathbf{R}^7$. From the relation $z^i = \frac{L_m}{c} y^i$ it follows the existence of an upper bound for $a^2 = a_{ij}(x) a^i a^j = a^i a_i$ when $a_{ij}(x) = \delta_{ij}$.

One of the differences between the present treatment of maximal acceleration and other treatments found in the literature (see [4],[5],[6],[10] and [11] for instance) is that in those works the maximal acceleration corresponds to an upper bound for $a_\mu a^\mu$, being defined by the covariant formula

$$a^2 = c^4 g_{\mu\nu} \frac{Dv^\mu}{d\tau_4} \frac{Dv^\nu}{d\tau_4}, \quad \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3.$$

From the perspective adopted in *Section 2*, it is natural to introduce the relativity group $O(1,6)$ because we use the same external parameter t in the definition of acceleration and velocity; apparently there is not need for another external time parameter. However, there is a difference between the internal time t and the external time s: t is compact while s is not compact. This eventually makes interesting the group $O(2,6)$ as phenomenological relativity group, while one can consider $O(1,6)$ as a further approximation obtained from $O(2,6)$ under the limit $dt \to 0$. $O(1,7)$ leaves invariant the metric $(-1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1)$ and is defined in the manifold $\mathbf{S^1} \times \mathbf{R^7}$.

Other possibility is to consider the internal time t as being also non-compact, but imaginary and admitting only periodic solutions. In this case, the phenomenological relativity group is $O(1,7)$. In this case, time is defined by a complex number $\sigma = s + \imath t$, the group leaves invariant the metric the hermitian metric $(-1,1,1,1,1,1,1)$ in $\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{R^6}$. Again, we consider the subgroup $O(1,6)$ as an approximation.

From our Hamiltonian perspective, the natural structure describing a fundamental system is an 8-manifold, locally diffeomorphic to $\mathbf{S^1} \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{M}_6$, where $\mathbf{M}_6$ is the "configuration" space manifold (in the simplest case $\mathbf{M}_6$ is $\mathbf{TM}_3$) for one ontological degree of freedom and $\mathbf{R}$ describes the time parameter s target space.

In both approaches, a phenomenological point of view is taken. Since the basic geometry is $\mathbf{T} * \mathbf{TM}$, the most basic phase-space-time pseudo-finslerian structure that is locally $(\mathbf{T}^*\mathbf{T}^*\mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{M_t} \times \mathbf{M_s}, \tilde{F}^*)$, where $\mathbf{M}_t$ and $\mathbf{M}_s$ are the target manifolds for t and s. The dual Finsler function is defined by the associated fundamental tensor:

$$\tilde{g} := (g_t)_{ij}\, dx^i \otimes dx^j - ds^2 - dt^2.$$

The particular phenomenological structure that emerges is determined by the U_t-evolution.

The definitions that we use for inertial coordinate system and uniformly accelerated coordinate system are the following,

1. **Inertial Coordinate System**. It is characterized by the fact that every free test-particle follows a linear trajectory.
2. **Uniformly Accelerated Coordinate System**. It is characterized by the fact that every test-particle in permanent rest in such coordinate system or with constant relative velocity is described in a inertial coordinate system as having uniformed acceleration.

Let us write the generalized special Lorentz transformations for the metric (3.1) corresponding to the special transformations of the group $O(1,6)$:

1. **Ordinary Proper Lorentz Transformations.** They relate the coordinates (x^0, x) and $(\bar{x}^0, \bar{x})$ of two inertial coordinate systems:

   $$\bar{x}^0 = \frac{x^0 - \beta x_1}{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}, \quad \bar{x}_1 = \frac{x_1 - \beta x^0}{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}},$$

   being $\beta = \frac{v}{c}$. This transformation can be re-written as

   $$\bar{t} = \frac{t - \frac{v}{c^2}x_1}{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}, \quad \bar{x}_1 = \frac{x_1 - vt}{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}. \tag{3.2}$$

   Well known properties of this transformations are that they leave invariant the speed of light c and also the relativistic addition law of velocities implies that c is the maximal speed for physical interactions and particles.

2. **Pseudo Lorentz transformations.** They relate the coordinates (x^0, y) with $(\bar{x}^0, \bar{y})$ of two uniformly accelerated coordinate systems that initially are in relative rest. Similarly to the above case, the coordinate transformations are

   $$\bar{x}^0 = \frac{x^0 - \alpha z_1}{\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}}, \quad \bar{z}_1 = \frac{z_1 - \alpha x^0}{\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}}.$$

α is a 0-dimensional parameter of the group $O(1,6)$. Recalling that $z^i = \frac{L_m}{c} y^i$, the above transformations can be written as

$$\bar{t}^0 = \frac{t - \alpha \frac{L_m}{c^2} y_1}{\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}}, \quad \bar{y}_1 = \frac{y_1 - \alpha \frac{c^2}{L_m} t}{\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}}. \tag{3.3}$$

Comparing equations (3.2) and (3.3), we obtain the natural relation $\alpha = \frac{a}{a_m}$, being a the acceleration and $a_m = \frac{c^2}{L_m}$. Then (3.3) reads

$$\bar{t}^0 = \frac{t - \frac{a}{a_m^2} y}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{a^2}{a_m^2}}}, \quad \bar{y} = \frac{y - at}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{a^2}{a_m^2}}}. \tag{3.4}$$

In order to obtain the composition law for accelerations in uniformly accelerated coordinates systems, we perform a similar calculation as in the proof of the composition law of velocities in Special Relativity. Let us consider a particle moving respect the coordinate system Ob with acceleration a_1. Then the value for the acceleration $\bar{a}_1$ in a coordinate system $\bar{O}b$ moving with acceleration A respect the first system and instantaneously in rest with the first should be:

$$\bar{a}_1 = \frac{\Delta \bar{y}_1}{\Delta \bar{t}} = \frac{\Delta y_1 + A \Delta t}{\Delta t + \frac{A}{a_m^2} \Delta y_1} = \frac{a_1 + A}{1 + \frac{A}{a_m^2} a_1}. \tag{3.5}$$

The test particle is assumed to be also initially at relative respect the coordinate system Ob.

If a_1 and A are bounded by a_m, $\bar{a}_1$ is also bounded by a_m. In addition, a_m is partially invariant: any particle whose trajectory has acceleration a_m in a uniformly accelerated coordinate system, moves with the same acceleration in every uniformly accelerated coordinate system. Nevertheless, it is not invariant respect the Lorentz transformations: two inertial observers can measure different accelerations, even if the particle have maximal acceleration in one of the coordinates systems.

3. **Reciprocity transformations.** This transformations are similar to Born's reciprocity transformations([10]). They relate (x, y) with $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{y}_1)$ through rotations in the $(cx_1, L_m y_1)$ plane; they leave invariant the form $dl^2 = c^2 dx_1^2 + L_m^2 dy_1^2$. After quantization, this 2-form can be written as the operator $(\Delta \hat{l})^2 := c^2 (\hat{X})^2 + L_m^2 (\Delta \hat{Y})^2$. In the particular case of a system containing a minimal length L_m, we get the interesting formula

$$< (\Delta \hat{l})^2 > = c^2 L_m^2 + L_m^2 < \Delta \hat{Y} >^2 > 0, \tag{3.6}$$

4. **Rotations**. Rotations in the configuration manifold M consist of coordinates transformations between (x_1, x_2, x_3) and $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \bar{x}_3)$ preserving the 2-form $dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + dx_3^2$. However, orthogonal transformations between (y_1, y_2, y_3) and $(\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2, \bar{y}_3)$ appear in the group $O(1,6)$. Sometimes these transformations are induced from rotations in the space manifold **M**. Nevertheless, there are rotations in the space of velocities (y_1, y_2, y_3) independent of the spatial rotations, appearing as " internal rotations".

Any other transformation in $O(1,6)$ can be expressed as a composition of the above transformations.

After this short discussion on the interpretation of the transformations of the group $O(1,6)$, we can formalize our approach in the following relativity principle. By phenomenological laws we understand the physical laws governing Quantum Mechanic and the laws describing gravity:

Extended Special Relativity Principle. *The phenomenological physical laws are invariant under change of coordinates between uniformly accelerated coordinate systems, inertial coordinate systems and between both types of coordinates systems.*

The above proposition is compatible with the Equivalence Principle for bounded gravitational fields. Let us consider a test particle at rest in a particular uniformly accelerated system. The description of the trajectory in an inertial coordinate system is equivalent to a particle falling in a uniform gravitational field, if gravity mass is equal to inertial mass.

However the physical content of the above proposition differs from the Equivalence Principle. In the principle presented here, only trajectories of particles with bounded accelerations are allowed, possibly eliminating singularities in the trajectory of test particles, while in the Equivalence Principle, arbitrary trajectories for particles are in principle legal. The implications on the singularities theorems of bounded acceleration could be significant (for instance, it is know that maximal acceleration makes smooth the divergences in Quantum Field Theory [15]). A similar phenomenon is expected in case of a gravitational interaction preserving our Extended Relativity Principle, because in the best of the cases it will forbid divergent gravitational fields).

There is an experimental effect that could be testable the it Extended Special Relativity Principle. If the phenomenological group is $O(1,6)$, then the relevant invariant is given by the equation (3.1). The new null-interval is given by the expression:

$$0 = (dx^0)^2 - dx_1^2 - dx_2^2 - dx_3^2 - dz_1^2 - dz_2^2 - dz_3^2.$$

This is the invariant interval in our geometry, that implies the relation:

$$\frac{dx}{ds} = c\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}. \tag{3.7}$$

Although deduced for the group $O(1,6)$, equation (3.7) also holds if we take the limit $dt \to 0$, that is, we consider the diffusion evolution U_t as instantaneous.

Systems with strong gravitational field could be laboratories for this effect or, indirectly, could be used as a bound for the maximal acceleration.

4 Maximal acceleration and String Theory

Reconsidering the expression (1.1) for the maximal acceleration and the analysis performed in *Section 2*, we can argue a mechanism generating an upper bound for the acceleration: we associate the "average" of the deterministic finslerian model with the bosonic string model.

Consider the system composed by classical, elementary particles following an helicoidal motion described using finslerian deterministic model. In this case, the following relation between the period in time t and the energy (in particular, the mass) holds([16])

$$ET_m = \hbar. \tag{4.1}$$

The infinitesimal action of the particle is given by the product $Eds = mc^2 ds$ and after using ergodic hypothesis, is given by:

$$< dS >= \frac{1}{L_m}\int_L mc^2 dl\, ds = \frac{m_p}{L_p}\int_L c^2 dl\, ds.$$

If the transversal velocity v_z is of the same order as the rotational speed, of order c, then there is a constant $\epsilon \sim 1$ such that

$$< dS >= \epsilon\frac{m_p}{L_p}\int_L c dz\, ds.$$

The average action, integrating over the transverse direction, is given in natural coordinates by

$$< dS >= \epsilon\frac{m_p}{L_p}\int_\Sigma dA. \tag{4.2}$$

This is basically the action a classical bosonic string. Therefore bosonic string theory appears as a phenomenological description of a deterministic finslerian degrees of freedom.

Usually it is believed that string theory contains a minimal length. Since the operators defining the ontological states commute ([12]), we should postulate non-commutative relations for the bosonic operators of the effective bosonic string,

$$[Z_\mu, Z_\nu] = iL_p^2 Q_{\mu\nu}. \tag{4.3}$$

The tensor $Q_{\mu\nu}$ appears in string theory in a natural way ([13]). We have found a mechanism producing macroscopic maximal acceleration from ontological maximal acceleration.

Finally we note that in our framework the ontological degrees of freedom are defined by a complete set of commuting ontological operators,

$$[\hat{X}_i, \hat{X}_j] = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

In this sense, one should look for effects of the maximal acceleration in the lightest possible system. This elementary particles could be neutrinos. Then, maximal acceleration provides interesting bounds for the neutrino mass m_ν ([14]).

5 Discussion

The maximal acceleration studied in this note has its origin on the maximal acceleration of elementary, deterministic degrees of freedoms at the Planck scale.

We showed that an averaged description of rotational deterministic degrees of freedom are bosonic, closed strings. Since in this theory appears a fundamental, universal scale, it has associated the maximal acceleration discussed in the introduction. One can suspect that the reason why this maximal acceleration is of order $10^{52}\, m/s^2$ in string theory is behind relation (4.1) and have its explanation in the context of finslerian deterministic models at the Planck scale.

The requirements that we need for the existence of maximal acceleration are strong locality and causality. The value of the physical maximal acceleration is determined by these requirements and by the mass of the lightest particle at the Planck scale and not directly by the Planck scale.

The question of the relation of the new relativity group with the ordinary relativity group implies a symmetry breaking. Partially this was described in [7], but we make it for each of the phenomenological symmetries described before:

1. $O(2,6) \to O(1,3) \times O(1,3) \to O(1,3)$. The first breaking is due to the existence of a geometric structure, $\hat{S}$ that acting on an holonomic frame $(ds, d\vec{x}, dt, d\vec{y})$ goes to $(-ds, d\vec{x}, dt, -d\vec{y})$. This action is leaving invariant by $O(1,3) \times O(1,3)$. This is the group of symmetry in Caianiello's flat theory. Indeed it consists on the doubling of the symmetry when one consider the tangent bundle **TM** as primary geometrical object with the metric $g \oplus g$. This type of metric appears naturally in Finsler Geometry and it is known as Sasaky-type metric or *d*-metric. The corresponding space-time metric is given by g and the group is $O(1,3)$.

2. $O(2,6) \to O(1,6)$. In this case the symmetric breaking is associate to consider the limit $t_{max} \to 0$. Mathematically this corresponds to a limit of semi-Riemannian manifolds:

   $$(\mathbf{R^8}, \tilde{g}, O(2,6)) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{R^7}, \bar{g}, O(1,6)).$$

   where the metric is give by $\bar{g} = (g_t)_{ij}\, dx^i \otimes dx^j - ds^2$, with g flat. If the limit is consistent if $L_m \to 0$. In this case, the limit of manifolds is

   $$(\mathbf{R^7}, \bar{g}, O(1,6)) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{R^4}, \eta_4, O(1,3)).$$

3. $O(1,7) \to O(1,6)$. If instead of considering the above model, we start with a model with an ordinary new Kaluza-Klein dimension t, one obtains the following limit of manifolds:

   $$(\mathbf{R^8}, \hat{g}, O(2,6)) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{R^7}, \bar{g}, O(1,6)),$$

   with $\hat{g} = (g_t)_{ij}\, dx^i \otimes dx^j + dt^2 - ds^2$, with g flat. After this, the limit follow as in the above case.

These possibilities should be contemplated as possible rival models for the phenomenological geometry. The first one is the simplest from a mathematical point of view, being also rather natural.

The other possibilities make use of the limit of manifolds. The mathematics is considerably more complex and are not considered in the present paper. Indeed, because the tensor are homogeneous, it is better to consider evolutions in the spaces $\mathbf{S^3} \times \mathbf{R^4}$ and $\mathbf{S^2} \times \mathbf{R^4}$, because then the limit is taken on a compact manifold.

We must also note that although a limit, there is not a Inonu-Wigner contraction ([18]). The "contraction" is on the base manifold and it is more on the line of modern evolutions of Riemannian manifolds, that is collapsing processes in semi-Riemannian manifolds ([19] and references therein).

However, the above proposal have the common feature that although the speed of light is maximal and that there is also a maximal acceleration, they are not absolute invariant: a test-particle in a coordinate system moving with maximal speed or acceleration, can be described in another coordinate system as having lower speed or acceleration. In addition of slowing the speed of light is also common to them.

References

[1] R. Parentani and R. Potting, *Accelerating Observer and the Hagedorn Temperature*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**(1989), 945; M.J. Bowick and S.B. Giddins, *High-Temperature Strings*, Nucl. Phys. B **325**(1989), 631.

[2] R. Hagedorn, Nuovo Cimento Suppl. 3, 147 (1965); K.Huang and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 25, 895 (1970); S.Fubini and G.Veneciano, Nuovo Cimento 64A, 1640 (1969).

[3] W.G. Unruh, *Notes on Black Hole Evaporation*, Phys. Rev. D **14**(1974), 870.

[4] H.E. Brandt, *Finslerian Space-Time*, Contemporary Mathematics **196**(1996), 273.

[5] E. R. Caianiello, *Quantum and Other Physics as System Theory*, La Rivista del Nuovo Cimento, **Vol 15, Nr. 4**(1992).

[6] C. Castro, *The Extended Relativity Theory in Clifford PHASE spaces with a lower and upper scale* Foundations of Physics, **35**, no. 6 (2005) 971

[7] R. Gallego Torrome, *A Finslerian version of 't Hooft Deterministic Quantum Models*, Jour. Math. Phys. **47**, 072101 (2006).

[8] D. Bao, S.S. Chern and Z. Shen, *An Introduction to Riemann-Finsler Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 200, Springer-Verlag.

[9] R. Gallego, *A Riemannian structure associated to a Finsler structure*, **math.DG/0501058**.

[10] M. Born, *A Suggestion for Unifying Quantum Theory and Relativity*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond.A **165**(1938), 291.

[11] M. Toller, *Geometries of Maximal Acceleration*, **hep-th/0312016**.

[12] Gerard't Hooft, *Determinism and Dissipation in Quantum gravity*, **hep-th/0003005**; Gerard't Hooft, *How does God play dies?(Pre-) Determinism at the Planck Scale*, **hep-th/0104219**.

[13] Nathan Seiberg and Edward Witten, *String Theory and Noncommutative Geometry*, JHEP **9909**(1999), 032.

[14] G. Lambiase, G. Papini, R. Punzi, G. Scarpetta, *Lower Neutrino Mass Bound from SN1987A Data and Quantum Geometry*, Class.Quant.Grav. **23** (2006) 1347

[15] V.V. Nesterenko, A. Feoli, G. Lambiase, G. Scarpetta *Regularizing Property of the Maximal Acceleration Principle in Quantum Field Theory*, Phys.Rev. **D60** (1999) 065001.

[16] R. Gallego Torrome, *Quantum Systems as results of Geometric Evolutions* , **math-ph/0506038**.

[17] D. E. Kaplan and R. Sundrum, *A symmetry for the cosmological constant*, hep-th/0505265.

[18] Robert Hermann, *Lie groups for physicists*, Benjamin-Cummings, 1966.

[19] M.Berger, *A Panoramic View of Riemannian Geometry*, Springer-Verlag, 2003.